



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                             | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/904,112                                  | 07/11/2001      | Cem Basceri          | MIO 0057 PA (98-1070) | 1085             |  |
| 75  | 7590 07/19/2005 |                      |                       | EXAMINER         |  |
| Killworth, Gottman, Hagan & Schaeff, L.L.P. |                 |                      | KENNEDY, JENNIFER M   |                  |  |
| Suite 500                                   |                 |                      |                       |                  |  |
| One Dayton Centre                           |                 |                      | ART UNIT              | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| Dayton OH 45402-2023                        |                 |                      | 2812                  |                  |  |

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| •   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |
|---|---|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary  | 09/904,112  | BASCERI ET AL.   |
| Examiner-initiated interview Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit   |
|   | Jennifer M. Kennedy   | 2812   |
| All Participants:   | Status of Application: Ap   | peal peal  |
| (1) <u>Jennifer M. Kennedy</u> .  | (3)   |  |
| (2) <u>Susan M. Luna</u> .  | (4)   | ·  |
| Date of Interview: 29 June 2005   | Time: <u>3:00pm</u>   |  |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:  | nt's representative)  | ·  |
| Part I.   |   |  |
| Rejection(s) discussed:   |   |  |
| Claims discussed: None  |   |  |
| Prior art documents discussed: None   |   |  |
| Part II.  | ,   |  |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet  | RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS  | S DISCUSSED:   |
| Part III.   |   |  |
| <ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul> | e examiner will provide a writto<br>ecord of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
| Sensely M. Kennedy  |   |  |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/  | Applicant's Representative Si                                     | gnature – if appropriate)                                  |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Applicant's representative to request a copy of the IDS filed 10/5/2001, which had been initialed and returned to Applicant's representative in the non-final action mailed July 19, 2002 (noted on Office Action Summary). The examiner explained that the initialed IDS had been lost during the transistion of the paper case to an electronic case. On July 1, 2005 Applicant's representative faxed a copy of the signed and initialed IDS (10/5/2001), the IDS being signed and dated on 4/2/2002 and mailed 7/29/2002 was properly considered properly in accordance with MPEP 609. The examiner has attached a copy of the IDS to be scanned into the file in order to complete the application history.